

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Application of

John C. Harvey and James W. Cuddihy

Serial No. 08/452,395

Filed: May 26, 1995

For: **SIGNAL PROCESSING APPARATUS
AND METHODS**

Examiner: Luther, W.

Group Art Unit: 2731

Atty. Docket. 05634.0065

BOX: FEE AMENDMENT

Assistant Commissioner of Patents
and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Received
SEP 29 2000
Group 2700

**AMENDMENT AND REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION UNDER
37 C.F.R. § 1.111**

Table of Contents

I. AMENDMENTS	4
A. TO THE SPECIFICATION	4
B. TO THE CLAIMS	5
II. REMARKS	109
A. INTRODUCTION	109
1. Claim Accounting	109
2. Summary of Office Action Rejections	110
B. SUMMARY OF CLAIM AMENDMENTS	113
C. STATEMENT OF PATENTABLE NOVELTY UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111	123
D. RESPONSE TO ALLEGATION OF DEFECTIVE OATH/DECLARATION	152
E. RESPONSE TO OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION	153
F. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112	156
1. Response to Rejections under §112, first paragraph	156
a) Response to Written Description Rejections	156
(1) The Office Action Fails to Establish a Prima Facie Rejection Under the Written Description Requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112	156
(2) Applicants' Summary and Description of Integration of the Instant Specification	158
(a) "One Combined Medium" (pages 19-28)	160
(b) "The Signal Processor" through "The Normal Transmission Location" (pages 28-86) and "The Preferred Configuration of Controller, 39, and SPAM-Controller, 205C." (pages 156-162)	162
(c) "Operating Signal Processor Systems ... Introduction" through "Operating Signal Processor Systems ... Signal Record Transfer" (pages 86-278)	163

(d)	“Regulating the Reception and Use of Programming ... including Example #6” and “... Example #7” (pages 278-312) as well as “... More on Example #7 ... Combining ... Automatically to the Computer System ...” (pages 427-447).....	165
(e)	“Monitoring Receiver Station Reception and Operation” (pages 312-324)	166
(f)	“Automating Intermediate Transmission Stations” (pages 324-390) including “Example #8” (pages 340-354).....	166
(g)	Examples #9 and #10 (pages 354-390 & 469-516): “Automating Intermediate ... Station Combined Medium Operations” (pages 354-374 of Example #9) and “Network Control of Intermediate Generating and Embedding” (pages 374-390 of Example #10)	168
(h)	Automating Ultimate Receiver Stations (pages 390-427) ... Regulating Station Environment (pages 396-406) ... Coordinating a Stereo Simulcast (pages 406-419) ... Receiving Selected Programming (419-427).....	170
(i)	More Disclosure in the Context of “Wall Street Week” (pages 427-469)	171
(j)	More on Example #7 (pages 427-447).....	171
(k)	Controlling Combined Medium Operations (pages 447-457)	172
(l)	Transmitting Program Instructions Sets (pages 457-463).....	172
(m)	Audio Overlays and Other Overlays (pages 463-468).....	172
(n)	Examples #9 and #10 Continued – Viewer/Listener Station Functionalities (pages 469-516)...	173
(o)	Preprogramming Receiver Station Operating Systems (pages 516-532) and The Preferred SPAM Header (pages 532-533).....	174
(p)	The General Case ... Summary Example #11 (pages 533-557)	174
(q)	Conclusion.....	175
(r)	The Subject Matter in the ‘81 Disclosure is Specifically Included In the Instant Specification.....	176
(3)	35 U.S.C. § 112 Includes No Requirement That Identical Embodiments of the Invention be Described in Both a Parent Application and a Subsequent Application Claiming Priority Therefrom.....	178
(4)	Conclusion	179
b)	The Specification Enables One Skilled in the Art to Make and Use the Invention	180
(1)	“Digital” is Enabled by the Specification	181
(2)	“Data” is Enabled by the Specification.....	183
c)	The Best Mode of Practicing the Claimed Invention Contemplated by Applicants is Disclosed in the Specification.....	187
2.	<i>The Claims Comply With 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph</i>	190
a)	The Claims Define That Which Applicants Regard as Their Invention	191
b)	There is no discrepancy in the use of the term “Programming”	192
G.	RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102	195
1.	<i>Rejection under 102 (b) over Applicants’ U.S. Pat. Nos. ‘490 & ‘725</i>	195
H.	RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103	197
1.	<i>Prima Facie Case of Obviousness</i>	197
2.	<i>Rejection under 103 (a, b & e) over Applicants WO 89/02682</i>	197
3.	<i>Rejection over Greenberg, U.S. Pat. No. 4,547,804 in view of Galumbeck et al., U.S. Pat. No. 4,725,886</i>	198
4.	<i>Rejection over over Jeffers et al., U.S. Pat. No. 4,739,510</i>	200
5.	<i>Rejection over Hazelwood et al., U.S. Pat. No. 4,025,851 in view of the publication “System and Apparatus for Automatic Monitoring Control of Broadcast Circuits” by Yaname et al. and Hetrich, Australian Patent No. 74,619</i>	203
a)	Characterization of References.....	203
(1)	Hazelwood et al	203
(2)	Yaname et al.	205
(3)	Hetrich	206
b)	Absence of Comparison of Cited References with Applicants’ Claim Language.....	207
c)	Office Actions Improper Motivation for Combining References	209
(1)	Improper Combination of Hazelwood et al. in view of Yaname et al.	209
(2)	Improper Combination of Hazelwood et al. and Yaname et al., further in view of Hetrich.....	210
6.	<i>Rejection over either one of the common subject matter suggested by Campbell et al., (WO 81/02961, abandoned parent application no. 135,987, and U.S. Pat. No. 4,536,791), in view of at least one or more of: Breeze “Television Line 21 Encoded Information and It’s Impact on Receiver Station Design”; Schnee, U.S. Pat. No. 4,290,142; and Zaboklicki, DE 2,904,891</i>	211
a)	Office Action’s Failure to Identify Applicants Claim in the Rejection.....	211

b)	Rejection further in view of Zaboklicki.....	214
7.	Rejection further in view of one or more of: <i>Hazelwood et al.</i> , <i>Yaname et al.</i> , <i>Hetrich, Marsden, Young et al.</i> , "Journal of SMPTE" Oct. 1971, U.S. Pat. No. 3,761,888 to Flynn, U.S. Pat. No. 3,627,914 to Davis, Tunmann et al., U.K. Pat. No. 959,374 to Germany, Byloff, Chiddix, Skilton, Schiller et al., Zettl, Vikene, U.S. Pat. No. 4,547,804 to Greenberg, Jeffers et al., Diederich, Campbell et al. (WO 81/02961, abandoned U.S. application no. 135,987, and U.S. Pat. No. 4,536,791), Kazama et al., Gosch, Stern, Breeze, Barlow, Millar, U.S. Pat. No. 4,725,886 to Galumbeck et al., "CBS/CCETT North American Broadcast Teletext Specification," Zaboklicki, U.S. Pat. No. 4,064,490 to Nagel, U.S. Pat. No. 4,251,691 to Kakahara, Hedger et al., Anderson, Gunn, Gaucher, U.S. Pat. No. 4,290,142 to Schnee et al.	221
a)	The Provisional Rejection over Numerous References is Improper	222
b)	Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is Improper.....	223
I.	RESPONSE TO EXAMINER'S ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENT.....	225
J.	RESPONSE TO OBVIOUSNESS-TYPE DOUBLE PATENTING REJECTION	226
1.	PTO Assertions in Office Action mailed January 7, 2000	227
2.	The Scope of the Double Patenting Doctrine	228
3.	Patent Office Procedure	229
4.	Nonstatutory Double Patenting	230
a)	Standard for Determining One-Way Obviousness-Type Double Patenting	231
(1)	Identifying the Inventions Claimed.....	232
(a)	Scope of the Inventions as Defined by the Claim Language	232
(b)	Proper Use of Specification.....	234
(c)	Best Mode.....	236
(d)	Means Plus Function	237
(2)	Establishing Variations between the Invention Claimed and the Invention Defined in the Patent Claims 238	
(3)	Variations Would Have Been Obvious to a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	239
5.	Conclusion.....	242
III.	CONCLUSION	243
APPENDIX A	SPECIFICATION SUPPORT TO THE PARENT 1981 APPLICATION AND THE INSTANT APPLICATION	
APPENDIX B	PATENTABLE SUBJECT MATTER OF INSTANT CLAIMS OVER APPLICANTS' PATENTED CLAIMS	
APPENDIX C	CORRELATION CHARTS BETWEEN THE PARENT 1987 PRIORITY SPECIFICATION AND THE INSTANT 1987 PRIORITY SPECIFICATION	
APPENDIX D	GLOSSARY OF DEFINED TERMS TO THE 1987 PRIORITY INSTANT SPECIFICATION	

I. AMENDMENTS

The amendments set forth below are made in response to the Non-Final Office Action mailed March 30, 2000. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner enter the following amendments in the above-captioned application and reconsider the allowability of the application as amended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111.

A. To the Specification

Applicants request entering the below amendments to the specification.

On page 1, in the paragraph entitled, "Cross-Reference to Related Applications," on the second line, please delete:

"herein incorporated by reference in its entirety".

This text was mistakenly presented in the statement of the chain of priority of the application under 35 U.S.C. § 120. The statement is surplusage as the specification of Application Number 08/113,329 is the identical specification to that of the instant application.

On page 18, line 13, please change "Fig. 6" to -- Figs. 6a and 6b --.

On page 37, line 23, delete both occurrences of "units" and replace both occurrences with -- words --.

On page 37, line 24, delete "words" and replace with -- units --.

On page 37, line 25, delete "words" and replace with -- units --.

The above amendments to the specification are being made to correct typographical errors and to make the sentence consistent with the disclosure. *See*, Applicants' specification at page 14, line 26 through page 15, line 6. No new matter is added by these amendments.